

INDIANA BAR

FOUNDATION

2020

We the People

Judge Training

What is We the People (WTP)

- WTP is an instructional program that helps students master government, history, and social studies topics.
 - Students will be presenting about constitutional topics for evaluation.
- Focuses on the history, application, evolution, and philosophies of the US Constitution and Bill of Rights.
- Students showcase their knowledge and understanding through simulated legislative hearings.

WTP Organization & Competition

- Classes will have divided into six groups, corresponding to the six units of the WTP curriculum. You, as a judge, will only be evaluating one of the six units.
- The panel of students will deliver their presentation answering the question they prepared for that specific unit you are evaluating. This lasts four minutes. Then for the next six minutes, the judges will ask questions to the students to further probe their understanding and comprehension.
- Your job as a judge is to listen to the students' presentations and evaluate their argument against the scoring rubric provided.

Judging Organization & Structure

- Judges are pre-assigned to a three-person judging panel.
- Each panel will be assigned a unit they will judge.
 - At the regional competition, students will have studied one question per unit.
 - Thus you are judging the one and only question the students studied.
 - At the state competition, students will have studied two questions per unit.
 - You will be told which question you will be evaluating depending on which day of the state competition you are judging.
- Each panel will need to designate a chairperson for a given round.
 - The chairperson can change from round to round.
 - The chairperson's primary function is to read the designated question at the beginning of the round.

Competition Process

- Judges will log into the Zoom room that corresponds to their unit assignment. You will be provided the link to your correct Zoom room.
- A facilitator will be in the Zoom room with the judges. The facilitator will be the host of the Zoom room, time the competition, and keep things in working order.
- A breakout room will be used for judges to give them a “virtual room” they can go to have short discussions among themselves in between classes and not in the presence of any of the participating students.

Competition Process

- At the scheduled times, the students in the various classes will enter the Zoom room where you are.
- Once everyone gets settled, the judges will introduce themselves and ask the students to introduce themselves.
- Once introductions have concluded, the judge chairperson for that round will read the designated question.
 - The question includes the numbered root question and the bullet points, but it does NOT include the “suggested follow up questions.”

Reading The WTP Hearing Question

Unit Two: How Did the Framers Create the Constitution?

3. What were the major differences between the Federalists and Anti-Federalists?

- How did the arguments of the Federalists and the Anti-Federalists reflect their points of view regarding natural rights, republicanism, and the powers of the states?
- Why are the Federalist and Anti-Federalist debates still relevant today?

Suggested follow-up questions:

- a. Why did the Anti-Federalists believe that representative government could work only in small communities of citizens with similar interest and beliefs?
- b. How did the Federalists respond to the Anti-Federalists fears about a large republic?
- c. Why did the Federalists believe that they could not rely solely on civic virtue to make the new nation work properly? Do you agree or disagree? Why?
- d. What role, if any, can or should civic virtue play in today's society?
- e. Why did the Federalists claim that the Constitution did not need a Bill of Rights? Do you agree or disagree with them? Why?

Not part of the question to be read



Question to be read:
Root question plus
bullet points



Not part of the question to be read



Competition Process – Student Prepared Statement

- Once the question has been read, the panel of students have a maximum of four minutes to answer it. Students may use notes during this portion of the competition.
- The facilitator/timekeeper will give a “one-minute warning” after three minutes and a “stop” signal after four minutes.
 - Should the student panel not use all four minutes, the time not used will be added to the follow up question time.
 - Should the students go over the time limit, the judges have the discretion to allow *a few extra seconds* to let the students finish their thought.
 - Judges should be cognizant of the inherent digital lag that comes with a Zoom meeting as well as the “newness” of an online competition. Use your best judgement when it concerns timing the competition and be flexible in allowing any extra time.

Competition Process – Follow Up Q&A

- After the four-minute prepared statement, the student panelists are expected to put away notes.
 - Sometimes the judging panel may need to remind them to do so.
 - Being online, it will be difficult, if not impossible, to monitor that every student is not using notes during this part of the competition. Students and teachers will be asked to follow the rules of the competition and hold themselves to the ethical standard.
- The judging panel will then begin to ask follow up questions to the students. This will last six minutes, plus any remaining, unused time from the students' prepared statement.

Follow Up Questions

- The follow up questions are used to probe the depth and breadth of what the students know as well as to continue the conversation on the topic.
- Follow up questions can be derived from several sources, preferably in this order:
 1. Questions can (and should) be created based on students' presentation. Anything the students discuss in their opening is fair game for further questioning.
 2. Judges can create their own questions based on the original question the students answered.
 3. Suggested follow up questions are provided.
- Questions should be short and succinct. Avoid multi-part questions.
- If a part of the content in the prepared statement is unclear, you may ask the students to use examples to clarify what they meant.

Provided Suggested Follow Up Questions

Unit Two: How Did the Framers Create the Constitution?

3. What were the major differences between the Federalists and Anti-Federalists?
 - How did the arguments of the Federalists and the Anti-Federalists reflect their points of view regarding natural rights, republicanism, and the powers of the states?
 - Why are the Federalist and Anti-Federalist debates still relevant today?

Suggested follow-up questions:

- a. Why did the Anti-Federalists believe that representative government could work only in small communities of citizens with similar interest and beliefs?
- b. How did the Federalists respond to the Anti-Federalists fears about a large republic?
- c. Why did the Federalists believe that they could not rely solely on civic virtue to make the new nation work properly? Do you agree or disagree? Why?
- d. What role, if any, can or should civic virtue play in today's society?
- e. Why did the Federalists claim that the Constitution did not need a Bill of Rights? Do you agree or disagree with them? Why?

These are the follow up questions you can use if you need to in order to keep your Q&A conversation going with the student panel.

Note: Some of these suggested follow up questions are multi-parted questions, as admonished in previous instruction. Use your best judgement to ask an appropriate question to gauge the students' understanding of the content.

After the Hearing

- After the round, each judge should give brief comments on the round.
- The comments should center on what they did well and **constructive** comments on what would make it better.
 - Things on which you should not comment: Dress, background, camera quality
- Once the feedback is completed, the Zoom room facilitator will put the judges into a breakout room.

Scoring

- A scoring rubric is provided to guide the judges in their scoring and scoring consistency.
- The students are scored 1-10 in six criteria (1 is low; 10 is high):
 - **Understanding** – To what extent did the participants demonstrate a clear understanding of the basic issues involved in the question?
 - **Constitutional Application** – To what extent did the participants appropriately apply knowledge of constitutional history and principles?
 - **Reasoning** – To what extent did participants support positions with sound reasoning?
 - **Supporting Evidence** – To what extent did participants support positions with historical or contemporary evidence, examples, and/or illustrations?
 - **Responsiveness** – To what extent did participants answer the question asked?
 - **Participation** – To what extent did most group members contribute to the groups' presentation?
- Agreement on scores among the judges is not necessary.

Unit 1



Directed by the Center for Civic Education and funded by the U.S. Department of Education under the Education for Democracy Act approved by the United States Congress.

Congressional Hearing Group Score Sheet

For each criterion listed, score the group on a scale of 1 to 10, with 10 being the best score. Use a separate form for each group.

1-2 = Poor 3-4 = Fair 5-6 = Average 7-8 = Above Average 9-10 = Excellent

	SCORE	NOTES
1. UNDERSTANDING: To what extent did participants demonstrate a clear understanding of the basic issues involved in the question?		
2. CONSTITUTIONAL APPLICATION: To what extent did participants appropriately apply knowledge of constitutional history and principles?		
3. REASONING: To what extent did participants support positions with sound reasoning?		
4. SUPPORTING EVIDENCE: To what extent did participants support positions with historical or contemporary evidence, examples, and/or illustrations?		
5. RESPONSIVENESS: To what extent did participants' answers address the question asked?		
6. PARTICIPATION: To what extent did <u>most</u> group members contribute to the group's presentation?		
GROUP TOTAL		
JUDGE: _____	TIEBREAKER*	

*Please designate a score of any number between 0 and 100 that reflects this group's OVERALL performance. (This score will be used only in the event of a tie.) Please use the following scale:

Outstanding	90 to 100 points	Average	50 to 69 points
Very Good	80 to 89 points	Below Average	30 to 49 points
Above Average	70 to 79 points	Poor	0 to 29 points

Score Sheet

Link to better view score sheet:

www.civiced.org/images/stories/WeThePeople/The_Program/Hearings/crs_group_score.pdf

Things to complete on a score sheet:

Scores for each criteria

Total Score

Tiebreaker

INDIANA BAR
FOUNDATION



We the People
THE CITIZEN AND THE CONSTITUTION

Directed by the Center for Civic Education and funded by the U.S. Department of Education under the Education for Democracy Act approved by the United States Congress.

SCORING GUIDE – WE THE PEOPLE SIMULATED CONGRESSIONAL HEARING

<p>1. UNDERSTANDING To what extent did participants demonstrate a clear understanding of the basic issues addressed by the questions?</p>	<p>9-10 in-depth understanding: key concepts/themes/issues/relationships identified, fully defined and extensively described (e.g., origin, development, people, significance, impact); acknowledgment of opposing viewpoints (if any)</p> <p>7-8 good understanding: key concepts, etc., identified, defined, and fully described, including significance</p> <p>5-6 average understanding: key concepts, etc., identified, partially defined, and described</p> <p>3-4 fair understanding: some concepts, etc., identified, inadequately defined, and described</p> <p>1-2 little understanding: few concepts, etc., identified, inadequately defined, or described</p>
<p>2. CONSTITUTIONAL APPLICATION To what extent did participants appropriately apply knowledge of constitutional history and principles?</p>	<p>9-10 full, accurate, and appropriate application of knowledge (e.g., historical and current application, examples, effects, results, problems, issues, future issues)</p> <p>7-8 accurate and appropriate with partial application</p> <p>5-6 mostly accurate and appropriate with minor errors and inappropriate application</p> <p>3-4 some accurate and appropriate with significant inappropriate application</p> <p>1-2 mostly inaccurate and inappropriate with little or no application</p>
<p>3. REASONING To what extent did participants support their positions with sound reasoning?</p>	<p>9-10 strong support of positions with sound reasoning: conclusions reached with consideration of opposing viewpoints, opinions with reasons, noting relationships, grasping principles, logical inferences</p> <p>7-8 support with sound reasoning for most positions</p> <p>5-6 support with sound reasoning for some positions</p> <p>3-4 support with opinions, beliefs, guesses</p> <p>1-2 no support</p>
<p>4. SUPPORTING EVIDENCE To what extent did participants support their positions with historical or contemporary evidence, examples, and/or illustrations?</p>	<p>9-10 accurate support of positions with extensive historical or contemporary evidence, examples, illustrations</p> <p>7-8 accurate, good, but partial support of positions</p> <p>5-6 accurate support of some positions; inaccurate support of others</p> <p>3-4 mostly inaccurate support of positions</p> <p>1-2 little/no support of positions</p>
<p>5. RESPONSIVENESS To what extent did participants' answers address the questions asked?</p>	<p>9-10 accurate and full response to all questions: main and subquestions, follow-up questions</p> <p>7-8 accurate and full response to main and subquestions; partial response to follow-up questions</p> <p>5-6 partial response to main and subquestions; partial response to follow-up questions</p> <p>3-4 partial response to main and subquestions; little or no response to follow-up questions</p> <p>1-2 partial response to main question only; little or no response to follow-up questions</p>
<p>6. PARTICIPATION To what extent did <u>most</u> group members contribute to the group's presentation?</p>	<p>9-10 participation by all/most on an equal basis</p> <p>7-8 participation by ¾ of group</p> <p>5-6 participation by ½ of group</p> <p>3-4 participation by ¼ of group</p> <p>1-2 no participation</p>

Adapted from a scoring guide developed by the Hawaii We the People program

Center for Civic Education • 5145 Douglas Fir Road • Calabasas, CA 91302-1440
(818) 591-9321 • Fax (818) 591-9330 • cce@civiced.org • www.civiced.org

Scoring Rubric

Link to better view scoring rubric:

www.civiced.org/images/stories/WeThePeople/The_Program/Hearings/crs_score_guide.pdf

INDIANA BAR
FOUNDATION

Online Scoring

- An online score sheet will be used to collect the scores for our online competition.
- It's recommended that judges keep a paper copy of the form to use for each class while "in the moment." Once you've seen the classes, you can then convert your scores into the online score submission form.
- Sample online score submission form:
<https://form.jotform.com/201885102831147>
- Scores must be submitted no later than 30 minutes after the conclusion of the final hearing.

Online Score Sheet

Congressional Hearing Group Score Sheet

Unit *

School *

Judge's Name *

Drop down boxes allow you to indicate:

- Unit you are judging
- School/Class you are judging
- Judge (your) name

Online Score Sheet

For each criterion listed below, score the group on a scale of 1 to 10, with 10 being the best score. Use a separate form for each group.

1-2 = Poor 3-4 = Fair 5-6 = Average 7-8 = Above Average 9-10 = Excellent

UNDERSTANDING *

To what extent did participants demonstrate a clear understanding of the basic issues involved in the question?

CONSTITUTIONAL APPLICATION *

To what extent did participants appropriately apply knowledge of constitutional history and principles?

REASONING *

To what extent did participants support positions with sound reasoning?

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE *

To what extent did participants support positions with historical or contemporary evidence, examples, and/or illustrations?

RESPONSIVENESS *

To what extent did participants' answers address the question asked?

PARTICIPATION *

To what extent did MOST group members contribute to the group's presentation?

GROUP TOTAL

Drop down boxes allow you to score each criteria for the class with 1-10 points each (1 is low; 10 is high)

The group total at the bottom will automatically add up your scores. Compare that with the paper copy you used during the hearing to make sure things are the same.

Online Score Sheet

Please designate a score of any number between 0 and 100 that reflects this group's OVERALL performance. (This score will be used only in the event of a tie.) Please use the following scale:

Outstanding	90 to 100 points	Average	50 to 69 points
Very Good	80 to 89 points	Below Average	30 to 49 points
Above Average	70 to 79 points	Poor	0 to 29 points

TIEBREAKER *

Your tiebreaker score must be entered manually.

Once all parts of the score sheet are entered: Unit, School/Class, Judge Name, Scores per criteria, and tiebreaker, then push submit.

The form will not let you submit unless all parts of the score sheet are completed.

Scoring Differences: In-person vs Online

Regional Competition Only

- When in person, it's possible to rank the classes you see against each other as they are going to be compared against each other for advancement purposes.
- For this year's online competition, **at the regional competition only**, classes are NOT judged against the others that are participating in that same date/time slot.
- Judges should grade to the rubric, not against the other classes.
- Classes will be regrouped into geographic regions and advancement to the state competition will come from there.
 - There will be classes that you see that will be regrouped against classes you do not see for advancement purposes.

Scoring Protocols

- Use the scoring rubric for consistency.
- Indicate the correct school/class on the score sheet (or write at the top of your paper).
- Indicate the correct unit you are judging (or have the correct unit on the top of the paper).
- Indicate your name as the judge (or sign on paper).
- Score each criteria 1-10 (1 is low; 10 is high).
 - No pluses, minuses, decimals, or fractions.
- Check the total number adds up to the number you expect.
- Put a tiebreaker!
 - Tiebreaker is scored 1-100 using whole numbers.
 - This should be an indicator of the general sense of how the panel did overall.
 - This can be another factor to differentiate classes from each other.

Scoring Guidance

- Use the time in your breakout room to discuss privately with your other judging panelists about their general impressions or to determine if there are major discrepancies.
 - In between classes, judges will be put in a private breakout room where they will have private time away from participating classes.
- Agreement on scores among the judging panelists is not necessary.
- Do not share your scores with persons not on your judging panel.
- Scoring to the rubric will add consistency to your scoring. But don't score the first few classes you see in a way that you lose your ability to make a distinction in the later rounds.
 - Check your expectations of what a class will present and don't score too high or too low. Evaluate the argument presented using the rubric.

General DOs and DON'Ts

- DO – Direct follow up questions to the entire panel and not to any individual student.
- DO – While you're expected to explore the depth of the students' understanding of the content, do so in a civil and friendly manner. This should be 100% constructive.
- DON'T – Don't use dress, camera quality, or background as a factor in your scoring.
- DON'T – Don't use the fact they do or do not use notes in their prepared statement as a factor in your scoring.
- DON'T – Don't use the fact that you agree or disagree with the students' arguments as a factor in your scoring. An analysis different from yours, if supported by valid reasoning and appropriate evidence, should be judged on its own merits.

Zoom Tips

- Judges should dress in business attire.
 - Be aware of your movements and your camera if you choose to dress business “waist up” knowing that your lower half of your body is out of camera shot.
- Set up in a quiet place that will allow you to have no interruptions for the duration of the competition time block.
- Have a clean background.
 - No bright lights behind you. Have a clean room.
 - If not distracting, you may use virtual background if desired.
- Have a technology backup.
 - Connect to internet via hardwire instead of Wi-Fi, if possible.
 - Have a back up internet connection, if possible (cell phone hotspot).
 - Have Zoom app downloaded on your phone and connect that way as backup.

Watch WTP Zoom Hearing (12:32)

<https://youtu.be/Rbg0aJGvMAM>



Closing Thoughts

- Thank you for taking your time to participate in the 2020 Indiana We the People competition.
- Throughout this competition, you will be helping to determine our eventual state champion. But we also have the goal to give the students the opportunity to showcase their knowledge and understanding of the U.S. Constitution.
- We need your help in making this competition a fulfilling experience that it will prompt each teacher to bring their class back to the competition next year. Be aware of the hours of work each teacher and student puts into this, especially as they did so in the coronavirus era.